CONFIDENTIAL

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Memorandum of Conversation

746 R

DATE: June 21, 1954

SUBJECT: Guatemalan Case in UN Security Council

PARTICIPANTS: Dr. Jose Maria Chaves - Counselor - Colombian Embassy
Mr. David H. Popper - UNP

COPIES TO: DC/R
UNA - Mr. Key
ARA - Mr. Holland (2)
UNP - Mr. Taylor
USUN
OLI

Returned &c

714.00/3-2154

1—1493

Dr. Chaves telephoned at nine PM, June 20th, to say that Colombian Ambassador Zuleta was disappointed with the course of the Security Council proceedings on the Guatemalan case earlier in the day. He thought that on balance Guatemala was somewhat better off as a result of the proceedings and that we had made three tactical errors. First, we should not have assumed that the item was on the agenda and should have forced the Soviets to veto putting it on. Second, Ambassador Lodge should have ruled that the resolution was procedural and the Soviet negative vote should not have been construed as a veto. Third, the resolution having been vetoed, there should not have been a separate vote on a part of it, i.e. the French proposal refraining from acts leading to bloodshed.

I told Dr. Chaves I thought the Ambassador was mistaken. I said that we thought it had been useful to air the problem quickly in the Security Council and that forcing the Soviets to veto the resolution represented a clear gain for our side. With regard to the Ambassador's specific points, I pointed out that the item was placed on the Security Council's agenda at the beginning of the meeting by unanimous agreement; that we had not wanted to have a procedural wrangle about it or to take the line that a United Nations member could not appeal to the Security Council when it thought it was in danger; and that it would have been quite irregular for the Security Council to refer the Guatemalan case to the OAS before that case had been admitted to the Security Council's agenda. As to the Brazilian-Colombian resolution, I pointed out that it was clearly substantive under the San Francisco

CONFIDENTIAL

JUL 2 1954

2/9/82

X X

San Francisco declaration and particularly in the light of the amendment added by the French. I noted that we had wanted to provoke a Soviet veto and that there was no way in which a Soviet negative vote could be held to be anything but a veto. As regards the propriety of voting separately on the French resolution, I noted that the sponsors of the original draft had refused a separate vote on the French amendment to their resolution; therefore it was quite logical and proper for the French to re-submit the substance of that amendment as a separate resolution.

Dr. Chaves stated that Ambassador Zuleta believed that the OAS was precluded from acting on the case as a result of the present position in the Security Council. I strongly disputed this, saying that the Security Council had finished its action in the case, and that the OAS was quite clearly just as free to move in the case as it would have been if there had been no Security Council action at all.

Chaves said he was in agreement with the points I had made and would discuss the matter further with the Ambassador.

UNP - David H. Popper

UNA:UNP:DHPopper:jm